

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 2, 4-13, and 15-31 were pending prior to the Office Action. Claims 8 and 19 have been cancelled through this Reply and claims 32-36 have been added through this Reply. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-13, 15-18, and 20-36 are currently pending of which claims 1, 12, 23, 25, and 27 are independent. Claims 1, 12, 23, 25, 27, and 30 have been amended through this Reply. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the amendment and the following remarks.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants appreciate that claims 8 and 19 are indicated to define allowable subject matter.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 27-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Haas et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0141658)[hereinafter "Haas"].

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-21, and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Zhang et al (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004-0264780)[hereinafter "Zhang"] in view of Bhetanabhotla (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0167538)[hereinafter "Bhetanabhotla"] and further in view of Haas.

Claims 11 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Zhang, Bhetanabhotla, and Haas as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Neff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,780)[hereinafter "Neff"].

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended to recite the allowable subject-matter of claims 8 or 19. More specifically, amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "**controlling a zoom function based on said classification**"; and amended independent claim 12 recites, *inter alia*, "**wherein said display output controls a zoom function based on said classification.**"

As acknowledged by the Examiner, none of the applied prior art references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified feature of claims 1 and 12. (*See page 11, first full paragraph of the Office Action.*)

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 12 are allowable over the applied prior art references.

Independent claim 23 now recites, *inter alia*, "receiving user input to select an image as an image containing an object identical to the reference model from the displayed images of isolated objects of interest; and associating the selected image with the selected model folder." Independent claim 25 now recites, *inter alia*, "a unit that receives user input to select an image as an image containing an object identical to the reference model from the displayed images of isolated objects of interest and to associate the selected image with the selected model folder." Independent claim 27 now recites, *inter alia*, "receiving user input to select an image as an image containing person identical to the reference model from the displayed images containing faces; and associating the selected image with the reference model."

Support for the above-noted amendment of claims 23, 25, and 27 is for example can be found at least in paragraph [0029] in the U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005-0105806 ("Using this updated display 400, the user is able to drag and drop one or more of the sorted unknown faces from the "unknown" display window portion 406 into a model display window portion 408 (step S222). ... Thus, the arrangement of unknown faces in display window portion 406 is updated as the user drags and drops unknown faces into the model display window portion 408 to improve the user's ability to quickly and reliably associate unknown faces and the corresponding digital photos with the model folder 402.").

It is respectfully submitted that none of the applied prior art references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggest an interface to select an image of the unknown object of interest (unknown face) as an image containing the object identical to the reference model as recited in claims 23, 25, and 27.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 23, 25, and 27 are allowable over the applied prior art references.

Dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9-11, 13, 15-18, 20-22, 24, 26, and 28-31 are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency on corresponding allowable independent claim.

New Claims

New claims 32-36 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency on corresponding allowable independent claim.

CONCLUSION

All rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance.

However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.

Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claims does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


Application No. 10/734,259
Amendment dated December 23, 2009
Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2009

Docket No.: 0879-0435P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By  #58,755
D. Richard Anderson
Registration No.: 40,439
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicants